

Meeting Minutes  
June Lake Citizens Advisory Committee

Tuesday February 2, 2010  
June Lake Community Center

Members Present: Connie Black, Jerry Allendorf, BZ Miller, David Naaden, Dale Bromberger, Dan Roberts, Jil Stark, Rob Morgan

County Staff: Heather DeBethizy, Larry Johnston, Scott Burns, Mark Magit (Counsel), Jeff Watlers (Roads)

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:05pm by Vice Chair David Naaden.
2. Public Comment:
  - Mono Sheriff and CHP representatives were on hand with updates and to receive any input that the public would like to offer. The CHP radar trailer has had some problems with batteries but will be available next week. It will be placed between the Fire Station and the 25MPH sign. Regarding recent road closures, the issue causing closures has been visibility, and some Big Rig trucks that have slid to the side causing partial blockages.
  - Jerry Hallum spoke to commend the law enforcement officials for being able to provide some advance notice of impending closures and allowing residents to return home from school or work. It was acknowledged that this is difficult to coordinate and to get the information out in a timely manner.
  - David Naaden brought to attention the efforts of Doug Nidever, who has been clearing snow from the frozen surface of Gull Lake, maintaining an area for skating and other ice activities. He noted that this helps to fulfill Policy 4 of the Tourism Element in the June Lake Area Plan.
3. It was moved by Jil Stark and seconded by Jerry Hallum to approve the minutes of the January 5 meeting. Heather DeBethizy noted that in item #10 the units under construction are not condominiums. The motion passed unanimously with the exception of Dan Roberts who was not present on January 5.
4. Vice chair reported that Dean Rosnau was unable to contact the Forest Service regarding the issue of dying trees. Public Works has fixed the lights that were not functional at the Community Center.
5. Jil Stark made a report on the recent Trails Committee meeting. Plans are for upgrading and widening existing trails on Forest Service lands, to meet current USFS standards. Map copies of the proposal for a "Down Canyon" trail were distributed for review.
  - Jerry Hallum asked if there will be winter signage in the trail plans. Jil responded yes, the trails may be used for ski touring/snowshoeing and perhaps snowmobiling in some instances.

(Items 6,7, and 8 were deferred in order to take up item 9a: Intrawest Rodeo Grounds Specific Plan and EIR Status):

Joe Walsh of Intrawest introduced attorney Mark Carney, and explained the status of the Rodeo Grounds application: there is a need to be realistic in terms of market changes, and therefore Intrawest is asking for more generality, to come back later and apply for use permits for

construction, rather than to ask for complete approval of a very large, phased project at this time. He invited questions and discussion from the room.

- Jil Stark inquired about trails. Walsh stated there would be no changes, there will be easements over roads and open spaces. Construction of trails from future projects to connect with other community trails would enhance such projects and yes they would want to commit to the construction of trails within the Rodeo Grounds.
- Jil Stark then pressed Mr. Walsh regarding “phasing.” She stressed her feeling that the community needs “hot beds” before other types of development and asked for a response. Mr. Walsh replied that Intrawest is not disagreeing, and no changes in the room mix are being proposed. He noted however that financing can be a double-edged sword, and that the bigger the project is, the more difficult it may be to obtain financing. He also noted that projects with Front Desks are especially difficult. Although there are really no substantive changes to the plan, and they would be motivated to move ahead with these projects, he is unable to answer because the market will be the driving factor, and the future of the market is unknown.
- Carl Williams added on behalf of June Mountain, that they would love to have a resort built first, but the world has changed. Some other development will be necessary. There will be no ski area improvements until some “hot beds” are built. Walsh noted that the mountain or others will be third parties on the land, and they would foster agreements to build gondolas or other conveyances to the ski area.
- David Naaden noted that the CAC was furnished with copies of a letter from Mr. Carney to the County Planning Department, and inquired about the outcome or response to that letter. Scott Burns replied that the letter was responded to last Friday, and there are just a few more items needing to be clarified by Intrawest before the application can be accepted. Joe Walsh confirmed that they will clarify these, including PAOT, number of units, and some grading concerns. He feels that the County's requests are reasonable. He also hopes to finalize the application this month and return to the CAC's March meeting. Jil Stark said that she has a copy of the response letter, of which she personally approves, and urged that the other CAC members also be provided with copies.
- Scott Burns noted that all is expected to continue to be consistent with the CAC recommendations that have been laid out. The CAC may also be involved in the process of issuing future use permits. Walsh added that use permits will also be under consideration of the recent Peer Review process involving the CAC and others under the direction of Darin Dinsmore. A few alterations may be necessary based on market changes.
- Mark Carney reiterated that there are no substantial changes, Intrawest is focused on the same project but the complete specificity cannot be speculated. Unknowns must be addressed in the future at the use permit stage. Intrawest is volunteering to seek use permits at every stage to provide the community an opportunity to be involved in decisions at every stage.
- David Naaden noted an item that “jumped out” for him: item six amends the application to allow up to 40,000 square feet of commercial space in the resort core. Mr. Carney wanted to know if the community desired to have a minimum figure. The general consensus in the room was that commercial space is needed to grow our community and that a minimum figure might be desirable. Carney stated “We are not shying away from a desire to build commercial. If there was a minimum in the past we will adhere to that.” Carney felt that the maximum number was the more important figure for the community and the EIR consultant could use it for mitigation purposes. There was no intent to back away from commercial.

- Connie Black inquired about a potential timeline or a rough idea of how the process moves forward. Scott Burns responded that the Environmental Assessment process will be triggered by the acceptance of a complete application, and then within a year we should have a certified Environmental Impact Report to present to the Board of Supervisors. Joe Walsh added: “We are going to get it complete.”
- Al Heinrich stood to voice his concern that the last application request was very general: “To me it's a blank check.” We don't want to use all of the resources we have available. We may be out of water. We would like it to be a lot smaller. Heights are at issue, with 35 feet being the maximum allowed, and 60 feet for commercial. We think the best thing for this community is to get the resort in. Additionally, there are a lot of issues, other community members other than the CAC, they are being downplayed because the CAC represents mostly the business community. Scott Burns emphasized that this is just an application. The environmental process will provide ample opportunity for further input. There is no “go-ahead” at this time.
- Jil Stark then asked “Is this a specific plan application or not?” Burns responded that this only begins the process of formulating and writing the actual specific plan. Consultants are on retainer: they will do the EIR and ultimately the resulting specific plan itself. Along the way there will be public comment periods, and public meetings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. This is just the beginning of the process. Al Heinrich then added “We don't know any specifics. How can you accept it?” David Naaden asserted his understanding that it is only an application. Scott Burns reinforced that the analysis by consultants will be much more severe and more detailed. There is no way that the issues raised can be ignored.
- Joe Walsh pointed out that there will be one single application for variance on a building height. Mark Carney reaffirmed that there are no real changes in the application, and that the EIR consultant and the community need more details. “We respect the county's need for more information.”
- Lee Vorobyoff asked about the effect on existing business concerns within the community. Will there be direct competition with the commercial sector? Walsh brought up that the Economic Study performed by Catherine Hansford will be taken into account. He said “you certainly need to complement the existing commercial,” adding that a blend is needed and that lessons have been learned in other communities where Intrawest has had projects in the past.
- Patti Heinrich wondered about the EIR and future Use Permit processes. Would future use permits be combined under the EIR or require separate ones? Scott Burns responded that the EIR will cover the general proposal, while the use permits will address specifics such as architecture, etc. It is possible however that a use permit could trigger the need for an additional EIR; also CAC design review.
- P.K. Edwards commented that while various aspects of this proposal have waxed and waned the People at One Time (PAOT) figure has remained somewhat constant. Why when changing the number of units does the PAOT not also change? What is the impact of the community without the Rodeo Grounds? Scott Burns replied that the PAOT figure was originally more of a buildout calculation to comply with State Law when the area plan was put together, and was not intended to be a cap. Edwards added that he wonders how much the rental units will be used beyond their normal capacity. Craig Meinhard then spoke his disagreement and asserted that the PAOT is a limitation. He said that if the Rodeo Grounds were to exceed their share of the PAOT then it would invalidate all studies such as the EIR and the Water assessment. He explained to the audience his legal opinions as to why this

was the case.

- Joe Walsh asked to be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.
- Jil Stark commended Scott Burns on the completeness of his recent letter of Response to Intrawest. Burns stated that Larry Johnston and Mark Magit deserved much of the credit

6. (previously deferred and taken out of order from agenda):

Jeff Walters of Mono County Road Department presented a schedule of Snow Removal priorities to the June Lake area. He explained the priority schedule numbers one through 5 and asked that the public provide input as to whether some roads should carry different priorities. He also noted that a new piece of equipment, a small snow blower, has been added to the fleet and that it is working well.

- Rob Morgan noted that regardless of the published priorities, the County crew knows how to get the snow removal done.
- Craig Meinhard offered his thanks to the Road Department for doing a good job at snow removal this season.

7. Update/Review of the June Lake Area Plan:

- Carl Williams proposed that the Update process be tabled until the next meeting so that the members can have time to review their copies, which were distributed at the beginning of this meeting.
- Rob Morgan requested advice from County Staff on procedure. Scott Burns suggested that we should probably save the Land Use Element for last, and perhaps it would be good to work through the sections from the back and move forward. He said that it may be necessary to update the environmental document after this is done. It may not be feasible to get it all done at once.
- Patti Heinrich asked from the audience how the committee would receive input from the public on this.
- David Naaden suggested that input from non committee members be submitted in writing.
- Connie Black moved that the matter be deferred so that we can make a plan to update the plan, at the next meeting. Jil Stark offered a second.
- Rob Morgan agreed that we should not begin at this time, this took years to write.
- Jerry Allendorf said that we would be jumping the gun to start now.
- Jil Stark emphasized that each member should read through the plan in its entirety.
- Larry Johnston stated that he believes we will find that not too many changes need to be made, just updates. Substantively the direction of the community has not changed dramatically.
- The motion carried unanimously.

8. Scott Burns' presentation indicated that the County Facilities Plan was the basis for the impact fees being charged. The policy issue has been "on the radar" for a while. There is a State requirement to reevaluate every five years. Drainage and Traffic issues are also a consideration, and the \$5,000 per unit fee in June Lake is the highest among the unincorporated county areas. There are some issues: 1) should this be county-wide? 2) downturn in the economy 3) expand or reduce? Staff recommends an update of the Capital Facilities Plan, and Kelly Garcia recently conducted a workshop with the Planning Commission on this subject. The list of Capital Improvements did not exist when the first Capital Facilities Plan was done.

- Rob Morgan stated that he is not so concerned with the residential fees, but that the large commercial developments require hundreds of thousands of dollars on top of high building costs that make development unattractive. Larger projects are discouraged.

- Supervisor Vikki Bauer asked when this is up for consideration at the Board. Scott Burns replied that it will come up at the mid-year budget review. Bauer asked that she be provided with input, that she is somewhat alone on this issue because the other supervisors represent only the incorporated area of Mammoth Lakes. She asked that comments and input be provided on or before the Board meeting to be held on the last Tuesday of this month.
  - Connie Black asked about the possibility of placing a moratorium on these Impact Fees. Mark Magit noted that fees have been collected, and that since StanTech did the engineering work, there would be a legal problem with ongoing projects: public safety is involved. This is not like Mammoth's ice rink – these are important projects. Black asked if June Lake can be put aside on these projects. Magit replied no, because the area of impact is from Lee Vining south.
  - Jil Stark asked if Supervisor Bauer could serve email notifications to citizens urging them to provide input on critical subjects. Concerned citizens should attend Board of Supervisors' meetings.
9. Heather DeBethizy reports no development activity other than a permit for an addition.
  10. No new items were offered for the next agenda.
  11. Next regular meeting will be March 2 2010 at 7:00pm.
  12. The meeting was adjourned at 8:42pm.

Respectfully Submitted: Dan Roberts, secretary